This document includes Section 13.0, CB-M Class: Spark Ignition Outboards Less than 30 Feet in Length, Utility Boats, of the Draft EPA Report “Surface Vessel Bilgewater/Oil Water Separator Environmental Effects Analysis Report” published in 2003.
The reference number is: EPA-842-D-06-018

DRAFT
Environmental Effects Analysis Report Surface Vessel Bilgewater/Oil Water Separator

Section 13.0 – CB-M Class: Spark Ignition Outboards Less than 30 Feet in Length, Utility Boats

2003

SECTION 13.0 – CB-M CLASS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

13.0 CB-M CLASS

13.1 INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Effects Analysis Report (EEAR) presents surface vessel bilgewater discharge from the Uniform National Discharge Standards (UNDS) vessel group, "Spark Ignition (SI) Outboard Engine Boats." This group consists of more than 1,400 boats powered by SI outboard engines distributed among more than 90 vessel classes. With the exception of one 31-ft Air Force utility boat (U 31) and one 34-ft Coast Guard Aids to Navigation Boat (ANB(X) 34) that is at the end of its service life, all vessels in this vessel group are 30 ft or less in length. The CB-M, together with the rest of the outboard powered RIBs classes (e.g., CB-S, RIBB, RIBM, RIBL and many utility boats) make up the largest number of vessels within the group. For more information about the vessel group and the selection of the representative vessel class used in this environmental effects analysis (EEA), see *Vessel Grouping and Representative Vessel Class Selection for Surface Vessel Bilgewater/Oil-Water Separator Discharge* (Navy and EPA, 2001g).

Vessels in this group receive fluids in the bilge from rain and green water that drain from the weather deck, and condensation that forms on the interior of the hull. The main sources of constituents in the discharge are drips that may occur while refueling onboard fuel tanks. Boats in this vessel group lack auxiliary machinery with lubricated components that could contribute oily constituents to the discharge. To a limited extent, lubricants from steering and throttle cables may contribute grease and oil to the discharge.

13.2 DIFFERENCES FROM THE EEA METHODOLOGY

The analysis of discharge information and the presentation of results in this report do not follow the methodology contained in *Environmental Effects Analysis Guidance for Phase II of the Uniform National Discharge Standards for Vessels of the Armed Forces* (Navy and EPA, 2000b). The rationale for deviating from the established methodology is described below.

As determined in the Bilgewater FIAR (Navy and EPA, 2002b), the Collection, Holding, and Transfer (CHT) option is a feasible marine pollution control device (MPCD) for this vessel group (CHT is currently in use for this vessel group). Application of this MPCD option involves shore-side treatment of collected bilgewater at an NPDES-permitted facility, and thus results in no discharge of untreated bilgewater to the receiving waters. When this report was written, EPA and DoD anticipated that the level of analysis in this report would be sufficient to support choosing an appropriate MPCD performance standard for the CB-M vessel group because CHT is expected to be the preferred option when applying the seven considerations under the Section 312(n) of the Clean Water Act (Navy and EPA, 2002b).

13.3 SUMMARY OF EEA RESULTS

There are only minimal anticipated impacts to receiving waters if CHT is conducted appropriately. There will be no toxic constituents, conditions related to narrative water quality criteria (e.g., turbid water), non-indigenous species, or bioaccumulative contaminants of concern introduced directly to the receiving water. The only potential impact to the environment

identified for this MPCD would result from the discharge of treated bilgewater to a properly permitted facility.

13.4 MPCD RANKING AND ASSOCIATED UNCERTAINTY

CHT is the preferred option for this vessel group because it is assumed to have the least environmental impact when compared to the other MPCD options. There may be uncertainty in this limited analysis in regard to how much, if any, bilgewater is mishandled during transfer. However, because process knowledge of pierside management indicates mishandling is not a common occurrence, a determination of the frequency of this occurrence and associated uncertainty was not performed. Regardless of this minor aspect of uncertainty, CHT is the preferred option due to its minimal impact on the environment.